MICHELE NARDONE, CSR, RPR, Official Court Reporter United States District Court, Eastern District of New York

New York, New York 10007-2601

United States District Court, Eastern District of New York

4 Proceedings defendant as to his financial situation? 1 2 MS. DANIEL: I would --3 THE COURT: Something has to be submitted to the Court 4 on that? 5 MS. DANIEL: I will have it filled out tonight. 6 The indication that counsel said is some THE COURT: 7 friends or relatives of the defendant were going to retain 8 someone on his behalf. 9 MS. DANIEL: As to the financial affidavit, he is 10 presently incarcerated. I don't think we are able to make the 11 bail conditions at this time. He also has been told that he 12 can't work, obviously. 13 THE COURT: We are getting to that. 14 MS. DANIEL: Right. So even if he were to be released 15 and we were to satisfy the bail conditions, I would assume at 16 this time he was financially unable to pay an attorney. are able to satisfy the bail and he is able to work then I 17 assume he would not be entitled to counsel at that time, but 18 19 that hasn't happened yet. 20 I will leave, your Honor. MR. BURKE: Thank you. 21 It's a pleasure. 22 THE COURT: Okay. All right. The purpose of this 23 appearance is to deal with certain information that was 24 provided to the Court at the last appearance, having to do with 25 communications of the Business Integrity Commission to the

1 defendant's employer.

Could you just go over that for me.

MR. BURLINGAME: Judge, I actually think that I could give you a brief background and I think one of the issues has been mooted based on a conversation I had with Ms. Daniel last night, which is I think the original issue that your Honor was upset about was that an understanding that Nacirema,

Mr. Calvo's former employer, had wanted to sign on as a surety on his behalf and that the Business Integrity Commission had stepped in and somehow prevented that from happening.

I was talking to Ms. Daniel last night and said it was my understanding that's why we were having a hearing this morning, and she said that was a misunderstanding on my part as well as I guess maybe the Court's part as to what her representation was concerning the Business Integrity

Commission's role and in fact it had not stepped in and sort of blocked Nacirema from becoming a suretor and so that squares with the information we have since been provided from the Business Integrity Commission, which is that they had no contact with Nacirema whatsoever. So I think that issue is mooted.

MS. DANIEL: Your Honor, that is not a correct rendition of our telephone conversation. I was telling him what I believe was specifically said to them. I would note that in Monday's Daily News -- I will read it to the Court,

MICHELE NARDONE, CSR, RPR, Official Court Reporter United States District Court, Eastern District of New York

1 "Last week the city Business Integrity Commission terminated
2 Nacirema's permission to employ Calvo."

The Business Integrity Commission, as far as I know, did have conversations with Nacirema. They were signed on.

What I had said to Mr. Burlingame was I don't know if they specifically said they can't be sureties but my understanding was they basically said for them to cut their ties from Mr. Calvo, which made them basically cut their ties from Mr. Calvo.

They basically have an -- he said I'm part of the integrity monitoring team for Nacirema and based on the allegations contained in the indictment as well as a letter from the Business Integrity Commission --

THE COURT: Absolutely.

MS. DANIEL: -- the future employment of Mr. Calvo would jeopardize the company's licensing. Also, the decision to terminate Mr. Calvo is final. Based on that, they decided they would not be sureties for Mr. Calvo.

I note that prior to Monday morning Nacirema had told me that they were going to provide sureties and they were going to provide some money, provided that the financial amount was something they could come up with.

Monday morning I heard from a friend of the defendant's, a gentleman named Anthony, that Nacirema had decided based on their contacts with the Business Integrity

MICHELE NARDONE, CSR, RPR, Official Court Reporter United States District Court, Eastern District of New York

Commission not to provide any sureties and not to provide any money. In his words, they were told to cut their ties with Mr. Calvo.

So my only dispute with Mr. Burlingame was to the exact language. I don't know if they were specifically told not to be sureties, but according to Anthony they were told to cut their ties with Mr. Calvo and to not employ him, and as far as I know based on that they decided not to be sureties for Mr. Calvo.

The defendant's brother called me last night, and he told me that exactly what is in this letter that Nacirema told him, that if they were to act as sureties or provide any money they would lose their licensing. So clearly there was some contacts with them.

They had not been returning my calls or Mr. Burke's calls. I mean Mr. Burke can maybe tell you what contacts he had with them, since I believed I was out of the case as of Monday night.

THE COURT: You are back.

MR. BURKE: Thank you, your Honor.

The other thing I can add to what Ms. Daniel has, the press release from the city by the commission indicated that it in conjunction with the United States Attorney's office had told Nacirema to sever ties with the defendant and, based upon that, Nacirema, which was at one time considering posting bail,

MICHELE NARDONE, CSR, RPR, Official Court Reporter United States District Court, Eastern District of New York

said we are not going forward because our business is in jeopardy.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Let me hear -- let me hear from the city.

MS. SASANOW: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Your name again?

MS. SASANOW: My name is Terri Sasanow.

THE COURT: Sasanow?

MS. SASANOW: Sasanow.

THE COURT: Ms. Sasanow, welcome.

MS. SASANOW: Thank you very much, your Honor. If I may set out the facts and the background to this, your Honor, which I think may be helpful, the Business Integrity Commission is the successor to the Trade Waste Commission, New York City Trade Waste Commission, which was established in 1996 pursuant to local law 42 of that year. The purpose of that law was to set up a complex and extensive regulatory scheme to regulate the commercial carting business in the City of New York based upon years of investigation, culminating in a prosecution by the New York County District Attorney that found that the commercial carting business was controlled by a cartel comprised of all of the organized crime families in the City of New York.

As a result of that, a very comprehensive regulatory scheme was enacted by the New York City Council. Under that

Proceedings

scheme, the commission has the power to license trade waste companies, and one of the factors that they may take into consideration in granting or refusing to grant or denying renewal licenses is whether the company associates with publicly identified members or associates of organized crime. That is one of the factors, which is specifically set out in the administrative code, that the agency may take into consideration when they make that discretionary determination.

A facial challenge to the constitutionality specifically of that aspect of the statute was challenged the day after the statute was enacted. The constitutionality was upheld by the Second Circuit in a case called Sanitation Recycling Industries. I have a copy of the case here, your Honor.

In any event, the license of Nacirema industries is up for renewal and is pending before the Business Integrity

Commission at this time. In connection with their renewal application last summer, they disclosed to the commission for the first time that they employed Nicholas Calvo in a managerial position, and as a result of that disclosure they were required under the statute to submit a background investigation form of Mr. Calvo. That form was not submitted to the commission until January 28 of this year.

Under section 16-509 -- I'm sorry, 16-510(a), the commission has, after they received that form and they have

reason to believe that the manager lacks integrity, they have ten days to notify the company whether they may continue to employ that person.

Ten days after the form was submitted by Mr. Calvo, the indictment was announced in this court, and there was a public press conference by the United States Attorney and other individuals in which the United States Attorney publicly identified Mr. Calvo as an associate of the Genovese organized crime family. Based on that indictment and the press conference and all of the information that was made public on that date, special counsel to the Business Integrity Commission wrote a letter to Nacirema and said based on the crimes charged in the indictment and the identification of Calvo as an organized crime figure, the commission finds that the addition of such employee, quote, may have a result inimical to the purposes of local law 42, citing section 16-510(a)(2) of the administrative code of the City of New York.

Then counsel went on to say, quote, Accordingly, you are hereby directed that Nacirema may not employ Calvo pending the completion of the commission's investigation. Please contact me if you wish to demonstrate to the commission that the addition of Calvo pending completion of investigation would not have a result inimical to the purposes of local law 42.

So the BIC gave Nacirema an opportunity to respond to that charge. On February 8, the next day, Ronald Tobia, who is

a lawyer and part of the integrity monitoring firm that
Nacirema retained voluntarily, notified BIC that they were
voluntarily terminating Mr. Calvo's employment. It says in the
letter Mr. Calvo was an at-will employee working under a sales
agreement with the company. Mr. Calvo has been instructed not
to return to Nacirema's premises, not to communicate with any
Nacirema employees, and to correspond any questions to his
legal counsel. There was never any discussion between BIC and
Nacirema or the integrity monitor as to the question of
Mr. Calvo's bail.

Subsequently I am advised that when Nacirema's counsel heard of this proceeding here this morning they contacted BIC and said that they on their own sua sponte had decided not to do so.

THE COURT: Not to do so what?

MS. SASANOW: Not to provide bail for Mr. Calvo. They notified BIC that they were not going to do that; and I point that out, your Honor, because they do have a pending renewal license application pending under 16-509(a) of the administrative code.

One of the things that the commission may take into consideration is whether the licensee has ties to organized crime. I am sure, or it's reasonable to assume that Nacirema was concerned that if they did provide bail that that was something that might reflect adversely on their application for

renewal license, but that was not something that BIC communicated to Nacirema.

THE COURT: Could the commission properly adversely affect the renewal of a license based upon the decision of an entity to provide security for bail for a former employee? Is that something that the commission could do, and has it ever done so?

MS. SASANOW: Well, to my knowledge it has not done so. What it may take into account -- and I'm not saying what they are going to do because they haven't taken any action yet, but what they may consider is whether there is a business nexus, whether there is a business tie, between the company and publicly identified members of organized crime.

Now, what they would do in this instance, if surety was provided, I don't know. That's something that has not happened yet. But certainly that's a decision that's being made by Nacirema on their own, without any input from the commission, and based on its reading of the statute and the fact they have their own integrity monitor.

They are making a decision on their own. They are looking at the statute, they are saying this is what it provides, and they are making a decision. It has nothing to do with BIC.

BIC has not had any communication with them on this issue whatsoever, and certainly the correspondence between the

Proceedings

agency and the findings that the agency made had nothing to do with that. It simply had to do with the employment, and that was done pursuant to the specific provisions of the administrative code. They gave Nacirema time to respond, and they chose not to.

THE COURT: I have heard you. Did you want to say anything about that?

MS. DANIEL: Well, your Honor, I obviously wasn't present for any conversations between Nacirema and the Business Integrity Commission, so I don't know what was said.

The only thing I know that I can add to this is that they initially were agreeing to put up the sureties, agreeing to put up the money. They were actually going to have some sureties and someone with some sort of check Monday morning, when I got a message from a friend of the defendant's, Anthony, that Nacirema felt that they had to cut any ties with Mr. Calvo and that they were way too nervous to provide any sort of bail or any sort of bail package and that the defendant was now going to have to rely on friends who would attempt to get a bail package together.

I did call Nacirema after that and I said you need to let me know if you are now backing out because you are nervous because of the committee's communications, and he said we will not be providing anything.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, let me just point out a few

things. I'm looking at the press release from the Business Integrity Commission. And I note that at least three members of that commission are listed as having been involved in the press conference that announced the indictment. You have got the commissioner of investigation, you have got the -- you have got the chair of the commission, and you have got the police commissioner. I think that's three out of what, five.

So how many members are there of this Business Integrity Commission?

MS. SASANOW: Six.

THE COURT: You got half. So you got half of them. So basically, you know, if this were a third party, all right, and the investigation by the Business Integrity Commission were separate and apart from bringing the indictment, the groups participating in bringing the indictment, then I would say there is a line of demarcation, a fire wall or whatever, but what we have here is a situation where the people who are involved in the prosecution basically are also voting on the Business Integrity Commission on the licensure of that particular company.

Now, it's clear to me from the regulations, which I have reviewed, that the Business Integrity Commission can refuse to issue a license, a license, based on any number of requirements, including taking into consideration the pendency of an indictment or criminal action against an applicant.

There are -- I'm not quibbling with the rules, but my question has -- what my question has to do with is whether this entity has any authority to affect a license based upon the willingness of a company or an individual to assist in the providing of security for bail, and that's really my concern, that all of a sudden, irrespective of whether Mr. Calvo is employed or not employed by this company, under these rules, whether there is, there has been some implicit or explicit threat upon the company --

MS. SASANOW: No.

THE COURT: Let me finish.

-- as to assisting him with his bail conditions, which affects the Court because the Court sets the bail requirements and then the defendant has to go out and meet those requirements or defendant remains in jail until the outcome of the case. So that's the Court's concern, and there is this -- and there is this relationship between the members of this commission with the prosecution itself.

It's not a separate entity. You have got three members of the commission who stood up at a press conference when the indictment was announced. And I'm concerned that there is some sort of inappropriate pressure being placed upon these third parties as to assisting this defendant in obtaining the security that he needs for his bail. That's really all that the Court is concerned about.

Proceedings

I'm not worried about the constitutionality of the commission. I don't want to interfere with their -- the process that they engage in to license a company. I'm not even concerned about whether some company is obligated to fire the defendant or not use his services because he is under indictment, although I do have some issues about whether the constitution has been set aside.

There is a provision somewhere in there that says that a person is innocent until proven guilty of a crime. And so I don't know that if I were sitting on this commission I would necessarily have the same views as some other commissioners on that subject. That put aside, I'm only concerned about whether there is some explicit or implicit pressure being placed upon individuals not to provide security in connection with a bail package for this defendant or any other defendant. That's the issue, and I don't think you can answer that question.

MS. SASANOW: Well, if I may --

THE COURT: Because you are just here to say whatever the city wants you to say.

MS. SASANOW: Well, Mr. Manning is here.

THE COURT: Then Mr. Manning should get up here then.

MS. SASANOW: If I may, your Honor, respectfully, before he does, the representations that have been made to your Honor by Mr. Calvo's counsel are not based on personal knowledge and are not based on --

1 '	say is	disingenuous	at	best.	In	addition	to	which,	anyway	
-----	--------	--------------	----	-------	----	----------	----	--------	--------	--

MR. BURLINGAME: Judge, there is as much truth to that statement as there was to defense counsel's statement that your review of Mr. Calvo's bail was to be conducted according to a clear error standard of review.

I would invite the Court to print up the transcript of Tuesday's bail hearing and see.

THE COURT: I was there. I remember.

MR. BURLINGAME: Right, and at no point was the government saying why is Nacirema not signing on as a suretor, and I would also point out that many times defense counsel was representing that Nacirema had specifically been contacted by the Business Integrity Commission and told not to serve as a suretor, which I think is what got the Court so upset in the first place. Now she has backed off that statement, which is what I was told last night, which is why I represented I thought this was moot.

MS. DANIEL: I never specifically said that.

MR. BURLINGAME: There are a number of varying and inexplicable facts.

THE COURT: We have Mr. Manning here.

MS. SASANOW: Mansfield, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Mr. Mansfield is a person whose background and integrity are well respected. I know he has been in the district attorney's office in Queens County for many years.

He's just been appointed -- isn't he fortunate -- to this position recently.

And my question of Mr. Mansfield is: Does the commission take any position on whether a regulated company can -- or its principals can provide bail or assist in providing bail for a former employee or a current employee? That's really my question.

MR. MANSFIELD: Judge, the short answer to that is no. If you are asking whether the commission would look into a regulated company, if they were to post bail for an individual who has been publicly identified as being associated with organized crime, the commission would conduct an inquiry as to the business reason why that would be being done.

If it's on a personal relationship with the individual, that's something that would be taken into account. But the standard that the commission uses is to ascertain the good character, honesty, and integrity of its licensees and its registrants, and if — and I stress if — the posting of that bail went to the good character, honesty, and integrity of the entity that we license or register, then there is a possibility that we would take that into account.

Now, your Honor, with respect to Nacirema, a member of my staff had conversations with the attorneys that were retained by Nacirema because they are very concerned about their good character, honesty, and integrity; and they have

MICHELE NARDONE, CSR, RPR, Official Court Reporter United States District Court, Eastern District of New York

Who are they?

MS. DANIEL: To Mr. John Davis and to Mr. Ron Tobia.

THE COURT: Who did you talk to?

THE COURT:

23

24

2

3

4

6

5

8

7

9 10

12

11

14

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

MS. DANIEL: John Davis is the operations manager and Ron Tobias is an attorney. They also had a bail bondsman called Scott Berlin call me Saturday. So I spoke to him.

21

So it was clear -- I don't know what the operation of their minds are obviously, but they were going to have sureties and some amount of money Monday morning; and I would also say at this point obviously Nacirema is nervous enough that I can't force them to be sureties.

THE COURT: No one can force anyone to do anything.

The question is whether -- for the Court the question is whether the representatives of this commission used pressure to deter people from providing security for bail for this defendant and whether that, if it was done, whether it was proper or whether it was improper. I think that when you raise the issue, you and Mr. Burke, I was deeply concerned because I have had that problem -- you weren't here at the last meeting, sir -- in the past, where a firm, it was represented to me, that a firm had interfered with a family member employed by that firm from providing funds or real estate, some security, in connection with a bail application for defendant.

And so I'm very sensitive about that because, frankly, it's one thing for a company to follow whatever these procedures are and to meet the requirements for its operation and its participation in certain business activities, and it's another if principals of a firm or if the firm itself wishes to

Proceedings

assist an employee or former employee to have bail while he's under indictment, that's I think, you know, an entirely separate issue. If the long arm of this commission can influence a regulated entity from providing that kind of assistance to an employer or former employee and if this commission can reach some determination as to the motives of those individuals or that company, which is what this really comes down to, it's about motive. All right.

And I've got three of the commissioners are standing up at the press conference where the indictment was announced. Why shouldn't these three people be recused from considering this altogether as to this company? Because they already have reached a conclusion about this individual and perhaps this company. They certainly don't have the independence and the open mind, it would seem to me, to be reviewing the application of such an entity. Those are some of my concerns.

MR. MANSFIELD: All right, Judge. You raise a number of different issues.

THE COURT: I know there are a lot of issues here.

MR. MANSFIELD: I think, with all due respect, the issue that I believe you were most concerned about from your order to show cause was the issue involving our position -- and when I say "our" I'm talking about the Business Integrity Commission -- with respect to the surety, and I can state unequivocally that conversation never, and I underscore never,

Proceedings

occurred between a member of my staff and Nacirema. I've got the universe of my staff who were involved in that present in the courtroom today, and Sheryl Levine, my special counsel, is the one that had those conversations.

Now, with respect to the broader issues that you are addressing, Judge, the Business Integrity Commission is both a law enforcement and a regulatory agency, and we participate with law enforcement agencies, prosecutorial agencies throughout the tristate area in criminal investigations as well as our regulatory component. We have standards that we utilize when we are going to deny or grant a license. It is not -- it is not an amorphous standard. It's very clear.

As corporation counsel has already indicated, those issues have already been brought before the Second Circuit, in terms of constitutionality of the statutes and the standard which we use.

THE COURT: I understand that. I'm concerned about the case that's before me. I'm concerned about managing the case that's before me and the question of whether a defendant is able to put together the bail package so that he can be released prior to trial. That's my job.

MR. MANSFIELD: I understand, Judge.

THE COURT: And so any time there is a claim that there is interference in that -- you know, I'm not saying you are unconstitutional. The Second Circuit dealt with it and the

Proceedings

1 | Second Circuit has spoken, and I don't want to address it.

What I want to address is whether if the president of this company decides to put up his house for this defendant is that something that the Business Integrity Commission is going to examine in determining whether that business should be licensed in the future.

MR. MANSFIELD: Judge, if you are asking me will we look at that, will we look at that issue, if it goes to the good character, honesty, integrity of Nacirema, that would be a factor that we would look at.

THE COURT: I don't know what that means. That's lawyer talk.

MR. MANSFIELD: Well, good character, honesty, and integrity is a standard in our statute, and as a corporate entity the issue becomes why is a corporate entity -- and it's a motivational issue -- why is a corporate entity putting up a surety for an individual who has been publicly identified as being involved with organized crime.

THE COURT: I didn't say an entity. I said an individual.

MR. MANSFIELD: Judge, an individual is different.

THE COURT: I didn't ask you about the entity.

Look, I specifically asked you a question about an individual, not about the corporate entity. I understand the argument about the corporate entity and its assets and so on.

If the president of a company is the best friend of the person who has been indicted, and the president of the company or his spouse or his child or somebody decides to put up, you know, a house with \$100,000 in equity toward bail, is that something that you could -- and this is not specific to this case -- but that this commission could consider that goes to the standards that you are obligated to investigate?

MR. MANSFIELD: Is it something we can look at, the answer to that is yes. The fact pattern that you just gave, about it being a personal friend or a family member, I am sure we have had that many times, where bail has been put up by a principal of a company that is licensed by us and it has not affected their license.

So, you know, it's difficult to answer it other than to say it is something that the commission would be concerned about, but if it's a family member or a personal friend relationship, other than in the individual's capacity as a principal of the company, that's a different story, Judge.

THE COURT: I understand your point, and there is no desire on the part of the Court to have any kind of chilling effect on your ability to do your job. I think it's an important job and you need to do it without constraint.

On the other hand, I have a concern about a defendant who is sitting in jail. I have set the requirements for bail, and I'm concerned about the chilling effect upon his rights and

Proceedings

also the rights of the person who is going to put up the bail money perhaps.

If the impression is that by providing bail the entity or the individual has an adverse inference against the organization or the individual created as a result that the -- that there is something about it that's untoward.

MR. MANSFIELD: Judge, you know the facts --

THE COURT: And the other problem is that you have got your commissioners are all part of this -- engaged in this litigation because they stood up together and it's in your press release, and I mean it's just -- it might be piling on.

My job, I'm here to make sure that we don't prejudge these defendants and we don't put them in jail unnecessarily before they have their day in court.

MR. MANSFIELD: Judge, with all due respect, the issue of members of the commission being involved in the investigation and being involved in the press conference for that matter is, in my opinion, most respectfully, is a totally different issue.

We participate in investigations, and we also —
criminal investigations, and we also have a regulatory
component also that has standards that I have already spoken
to. But I think the best way to address this issue, Judge, is,
quite frankly, you know, we are speaking on behalf of the
principals of Nacirema. Nacirema should really speak to you

Proceedings

directly, because the conversations that we had with Nacirema and the conversations that defense counsel had with Nacirema seem to be 180 degrees apart.

THE COURT: Do you have conversations with regulated parties other than on paper or at hearings where you have a court reporter? Are there these friendly discussions that you have with your regulated parties?

MR. MANSFIELD: There are discussions we have with our regulated parties. I wouldn't be in position to characterize them as friendly or unfriendly.

THE COURT: Informal.

MR. MANSFIELD: Informal. Our attorney speaks to them on a regular basis because they are always having issues with respect to some licensing matters, and the individual who handled this case is our special counsel, Sheryl Levine, who is present now, and she is the individual who informed me that Nacirema's position was unequivocal.

THE COURT: Could she just come up and so she can -- I could just briefly hear from her about this.

MR. MANSFIELD: Again, Judge, I think the best evidence here would be to have one of the principals of Nacirema say what was said to us.

THE COURT: Ms. Levine, just state your name, ma'am.

MS. LEVINE: Sheryl, S-H-E-R-Y-L, Levine, L-E-V-I-N-E.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

1 MS. LEVINE: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: You heard all of this discussion. Could you just illuminate me on what discussions were had with Nacirema between you and Nacirema's principals or attorneys.

MS. LEVINE: The only contacts I had with employees or principals of Nacirema was the letter that I sent to them saying that you are hereby directed not to employ Calvo until the end of our investigation.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LEVINE: I did have conversation with Ron Tobia, who is the lawyer and integrity monitor for Nacirema. Subsequently to my sending of that letter he called me and said we are terminating Calvo; and I said thank you for notifying me, can you please send me something in writing.

THE COURT: Confirmation?

MS. LEVINE: Right, about that, which he did.

THE COURT: Did you have any discussion about whether anybody at Nacirema or the company should assist this defendant with his bail?

MS. LEVINE: The issue of bail was not raised at all during that conversation.

THE COURT: Or at any other time?

MS. LEVINE: At any other time. That was the only conversation I had prior to our receiving the order to show cause from your Honor.

Proceedings

1 THE COURT: And after that?

MS. LEVINE: Subsequent to that Mr. Tobia did call me again when he heard about this proceeding, and he was very animated in that conversation, and he was saying --

MS. DANIEL: Can we have a date on that?

THE COURT: Well, it wasn't that long ago.

MS. LEVINE: It was yesterday.

THE COURT: Go ahead. He was animated.

MS. LEVINE: He was animated and he said that he's the integrity monitor, and of course once the indictment came down that they were going to terminate Calvo and of course they weren't going to put up his bail, and that was solely his decision.

THE COURT: Not to put up the bail?

MS. LEVINE: Exactly. And the only direct question -- I didn't interrupt him. He was very animated.

The only question I put to him directly was: Was your decision about bail, did it have anything to do with any representations by the Business Integrity Commission, and he said absolutely not.

THE COURT: Who selects the integrity monitor?

MS. LEVINE: Actually, the first time I heard that Nacirema had an integrity monitor was the very first phone call that Mr. Tobia made to me. He said that it's a voluntary program that they developed on their own.

Proceedings

1 THE COURT: Who is "they"?

MS. LEVINE: There are times where the commission does impose as a condition of a license that the company take on a monitor. This is not one of those cases.

THE COURT: So they took -- they retained, meaning Nacirema retained, the integrity monitor on its own is your understanding.

MS. LEVINE: That's my understanding, yes.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Well -- yes?

MS. DANIEL: If I can add, it's clear to me at this point Nacirema is not going to put up the bail.

THE COURT: Yes, I understand that, but my concern is that there shouldn't be activity going on --

MS. DANIEL: Absolutely.

THE COURT: -- around town influencing whether individuals should be providing bail or not providing bail. The only issue about bail should be here in the courthouse.

MS. DANIEL: I agree, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that's really a message that I'm trying to send to everybody, that we not have a substratum of activity in a case such as this; and it could come up again in this case or some other case where there is an accusation or an actuality of a government agency somehow interfering in the ability of a defendant in securing his bail or her bail.

MICHELE NARDONE, CSR, RPR, Official Court Reporter

That's really where I am.

United States District Court, Eastern District of New York

And what I'm hearing from the chair of the commission is that no such thing happened in the case of the Business Integrity Commission. I take him at his word.

And I just want the message to be spread throughout the land that this is the type of issue that concerns the Court and that going forward there should be care taken in these relationships, with regard to the subject of bail. That's really where I'm going here, and since it's the second time I have heard something like this during my relatively brief career here, I thought it was important to put a special, a finer point on my concern.

So is there something else you would like to say?

MS. DANIEL: Yes. I mean I'm not saying that Nacirema was ever told -- as a matter of fact, they started basically ignoring our phone calls after Monday. So I'm not saying they were ever told not to post bond, but we are hearing that that is something that could be considered in the licensing. So I'm sure Ron Tobia, who is someone who dealt with this, was sufficiently nervous not to post the bail.

I can say unequivocally that they were going to assist by providing sureties and providing money. So I don't know what the conversations were. I take them at their word that that was never said.

However, I think Nacirema was nervous enough subjectively or objectively not to want to come forward. They

And all I'm saying, what I'm saying is that the Court has to be mindful that it becomes much more difficult for

MICHELE NARDONE, CSR, RPR, Official Court Reporter United States District Court, Eastern District of New York

24

1.0

someone accused of a crime to get the help he needs or she needs to make bail, if that kind of perceived pressure -- I'm not even saying it's real, but it's perceived -- exists; and I want to minimize it, if I can.

You have someone here who has worked for the same company for seven years. Now, whether or not he has broken the law, that will be resolved at some later time; and my concern is that he could sit in jail for a good, long time, in part because of the perception that this commission, comprised in large measure of people who, you know, have been involved in the investigation that resulted in this prosecution, might take an adverse view to that minimal kind of assistance that a former employer or principal of a former employer might provide.

It's not an easy situation. It's clear that they are not going to provide any assistance.

MS. DANIEL: I wouldn't want to ask them for it.

THE COURT: But I want everyone to understand that there is the issue of this commission doing its job, and then there is the issue of creating a set of conditions for bail that are both reasonable and achievable; and I don't want any interference. My understanding from what I have heard today is there hasn't been any active interference. The existence of this commission is what it is.

So this defendant is going to have to look elsewhere.

Proceedings

I do believe what you say, that the representations to you originally were that these folks were going to provide some -- were going to serve as suretors and that they got scared off because of what they perceived as the potential adverse inferences that could be drawn by this commission. Well, you know, you can't -- we don't live in a perfect world either, but I am concerned about it.

MS. DANIEL: Well, I think it's entirely reasonable for them to respond that way, and that's why I wouldn't push it with them.

I will note that the defendant at this time can now not meet the bail conditions. Obviously, he wasn't able to pay for the private attorney. I will assist him in any way I can, if I stay on for the entire length of the case.

THE COURT: Is there a reason why you wouldn't?

MS. DANIEL: No.

THE COURT: Oh, good.

MS. DANIEL: I'm just sorry, your Honor. But in any event, he cannot meet these conditions. I believe he would have been able to meet the conditions had they assisted, but at this time -- and I haven't really been working on it in the last two days, Mr. Burke has; but there is no way to meet the bail conditions that we know at this point that were set by the Court, and again, I note that the government mentioned several times that Nacirema should be coming up with something, and

1 | that is obviously not a possibility at this time.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BURLINGAME: Again, that is absolutely incorrect, and I urge the Court to check the record of Tuesday's hearing.

THE COURT: Well, if there is anything about what's been said represented today that you find to be in error, and if there is anyone who would like to submit any kind of statement under oath regarding it, you can certainly provide that.

Otherwise, you know what the conditions that I have set for bail are, and if you meet those conditions then the defendant will be released on bail.

Does the government have anything else?

MR. BURLINGAME: No, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

Anything else from you, ma'am?

MS. SASANOW: No. Thank you, your Honor.

MR. MANSFIELD: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: I would like to thank you for coming in, sir. Thank you, marshals.

(All parties began to exit.)

THE COURT: Bring everybody back. Everyone comes back.

Look, this case is going to go on a long time. I don't want any kind of acrimony or recrimination, like the recrimination I have just heard when I ended this status

Proceedings

conference. You can have differences of opinion. I don't mind that. Lawyers get up in front of me all the time and have differences of opinion as to what was said, but I want to keep this all on a very high plane. All right. And that's, you know, I will listen to everything everyone has to say.

I will consider everything. You may disagree on what was said and you may disagree on what was said, but I would like you to treat this entity, which is the Court, with the kind of respect that it requires. So don't bicker, try to get along, all right.

MR. BURLINGAME: Yes, Judge.

MS. DANIEL: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And please don't make comments in front of me that I overhear that aren't on the record that upset me because there is a lot of real issues to deal with. And I really think that you ought to bury the hatchet, not in each other, and move forward.

I'm very concerned about everything that I have spoken about. That's the only reason I brought you here today, and I would like -- and I'm sending the message that I think is appropriate to send about how we should move forward. But I don't want you to -- I don't want this to descend into a shouting contest of sorts, and I just -- I want the tone to be positive.

MS. DANIEL: Your Honor, I would like to order the

Proceedings

transcripts from Monday's bail hearing and from Tuesday's as well, with the Court's permission.

I will note that Mr. Burlingame just called me a liar because I said that he asked why Nacirema was not a surety.

THE COURT: I was trying to --

MS. DANIEL: I would like to put that on the record. So I would like to order the transcript, if the Court will.

THE COURT: I was trying not to put that on the record. I was trying to move on from there.

MS. DANIEL: Well --

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. It's not going to matter whether he called you something or you called him something. That's not going to advance this discussion at all.

MS. DANIEL: I have no desire to engage in that.

THE COURT: I want to send a message to everybody that I'm not going to sanction it, okay, and it's more important coming from me than coming from you, frankly.

MS. DANIEL: Anyway, if I may have permission to order the transcripts.

THE COURT: Because you all have to deal with me.

MR. BURLINGAME: Of course, Judge. The government's word is very important to it, and I was upset that my word had been maligned on the record and I got upset. I apologize to the Court for that and --

THE COURT: I understand. Nothing else more need be